

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 21 and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 21 and 22 are independent and are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

Support for the amendments made herein is found in the as-filed specification and, for example, in Publ. App. par. [0139], [0162]-[0165] and FIGS. 1, 9 and 10.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 7,039,599 to Merriman et al. ("Merriman") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,308,202 to

Cohn et al. (“Cohn”) and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,146,567 to Duczmal et al. (“Duczmal”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 22 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“receiving an information picture from an information picture providing server, the information picture including a picture image, related information, and time limit information as a single handling unit.”

The information picture is received from a server and includes, in addition, to the “related information,” the information picture also includes “time limit” information. “Time limit” information is separate from the “related information” as described in the as-filed specification. “Time limit” information is defined in the specification at Publ. App. par. [0163].

FIG. 9 shows information picture with time limit information which differs from the “related information” as discussed above. Time limit information is information for prescribing valid time limit (effective time period) of this information picture and allows operation of the information picture to be disabled after time period is passed, allow information to be transmitted to the management server, or operation log of information picture to be invalid, or make prescribing operation so that a certain predetermined operation is first enabled after time period is passed. Among them, particularly in the case of allowing operation of information picture to be disabled after time period is passed, or allowing information to the management server of operation log of information picture to be invalid, the time limit information functions as lifetime information. Similarly to the related information, this time limit information also arranged as it is after processing is implemented within the comment expansion portion so that it is collected as

one picture information. Thus, as the result of this, picture information as data stream can include related information or identifier therewithin.

The Office Action, at page 4, points to Duczmal, col. 3:55 to col. 4:7, for teaching the claim 22 feature, “receiving . . . from an information picture providing server, the information picture including . . . time limit information as a single handling unit.”

At the cited location, Duczmal is referring to FIG. 2 and the software modules of the processor 26 and server 14. It is the processor 26 that performs the validity checks that relate to date and time. The result of the validity checks affect the information provided to the server 14. This is overwhelmingly clear from the arrow from the display location 12 to the server 14 in FIGS. 1 and 2 and the description at Duczmal col. 3:55 to col. 4:15.

In contrast, in the invention as claimed in claim 22, the information picture including the time limit is received from the server, as distinguished from Duczmal in which expiration date and time are provided to the server. There is no suggestion in Duczmal that the validity checks are done by the server that provides information ultimately to clients 16.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those recited above regarding claim 22, claim 21 is also patentable.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as

acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800